

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action of May 16, 2007 and the Advisory Action dated August 31, 2007. Claims 19 - 22 are pending in this application and have been rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

In the Office Action dated May 16, 2007, the examiner contended that under 35 USC § 112 (first paragraph) that claim 22 did not teach a specific wavelength of 275 nm and that the prior art teaches against the feasibility of measuring ubiquinol using the standard wavelength of 275 nm.

Applicant's specification at page 2, lines 15 and 16, teaches the detection of the coenzyme Q-10 by UV absorption at 275 nm. Mosca at page 53 teaches that 275 nm reveals only ubiquinone (coenzyme Q-10). Although detection of ubiquinol (2-electron reduced form of coenzyme Q-10) is not provided or required in Mosca, it is feasible near 290 nm in the UV wavelength range. All Mosca teaches is that 275 nm are used ubiquinone and not for ubiquinol. This is consistent with applicant's specification at page 2, lines 15 - 16. In summary, both the prior art (Mosca) and applicant's specification teach the 275 nm for ubiquinone. For this reason, the rejection of claim 22 as stated on August 31, 2007 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 USC § 112 (first

paragraph) as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, applicant has amended claim 22 to differentiate between the electrochemical detector and the separate item recitation of the separate element, which is the ultraviolet absorption detector that is recited as a separate element. This conforms to Figure 6 that shows the electrochemical detector (22) and the UV absorption detector (24). See also, applicant's original claim 18 and the description in the specification on lines 26 - 31 at page 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102(b)

As pointed out in applicant's response to the Final Office Action dated August 16, 2007, applicant uses a reduction column for reducing. Applicant pointed out in the previous argument that Edlund did not use reduction in a column, but instead, in a coulometric cell. The examiner has argued that Edlund's coulometric cell is a column. Applicant has now amended independent claims 19 and 21 to specifically require that there be a non-coulometric cell reduction column. This clearly distinguishes Edlund.


Applicant has previously urged that Edlund simply is not a column. The examiner has not accepted the definitions of column and has maintained the previous rejection. It is respectfully submitted that by this amendment there can be no doubt that the device in Edlund is not the same as applicant's non-coulometric

cell reduction column.

Attached hereto is a declaration of Osamu Shiota which shows that the reduction column claimed herein is completely different from a coulometric cell. This makes clear the distinction, which is now stated in the claim as "non-coulometric cell."

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and early action in accordance thereof is requested. In the event there is any reason why the application cannot be allowed in this current condition, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the number listed below to resolve any problems by Interview or Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald R. Snider
Reg. No. 24,962

Date: November 15, 2007

Snider & Associates
Ronald R. Snider
P.O. Box 27613
Washington, D.C. 20038-7613
Tel.: (202) 347-2600

RRS/bam